

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheet makes changes to Figs. 1 and 2 and replaces original sheet 1/4 with Figs. 1-3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 2 and 10-18 are withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 10 and 11 are amended and find support in the specification as filed at paragraphs [0022] and [0008]. Claims 5 and 14 are amended to correct typographical errors by inserting punctuation. Figures 1 and 2 are amended to include the phrase "Prior Art" as suggested by the Examiner in the May 27 Office Action. No new matter is added.

I. Drawings

Applicants have amended Figures 1 and 2 of the specification to include the phrase "Prior Art" as suggested by the Examiner. Consideration and acceptance of amended Figures 1 and 2 is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 3-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Without acceding to the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have replaced the phrase "a predetermined condition" in claim 1 with "a thermosensitive breakage or an electronic discharge breakage." As such, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not indefinite.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 3-9 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,700,550 ("Uyama"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a multilayer film having plural light transparent films which are laminated and are different from each other in refractive index, and wherein a portion of a

breakable print recording layer is removed from the discrimination medium and changes in color depending on the viewing angle. In other words, claim 1 recites that a portion of the multilayer film, having plural light transparent films which are laminated and are different from each other in refractive index, is exposed on the removed portion of the breakable print recording layer and will appear to change color when the viewing angle changes. See specification, paragraph [0008].

Uyama does not describe each of the features recited in claim 1.

Uyama discloses a transparent hologram seal including a patterned separating or releasing layer 18 and an adhesion layer 16 affixed to a to-be-affixed object 20, wherein evaporated layer 10 is broken when the seal is separated from the to-be-affixed object 20. Uyama, Abstract, column 8, line 41 and column 9, lines 31-33. Further, Uyama describes that a portion of the evaporated layer 10, which corresponds to the patterned separation or releasing layer 18, remains on the to-be-affixed object 20, and that this remainder portion of the evaporated layer 10 is affixed to the hologram forming layer 4. Uyama, column 9, lines 33-39.

However, Uyama fails to disclose a discrimination medium comprising a breakable print recording layer wherein when a thermosensitive breakage or an electronic discharge breakage is applied to a portion of the breakable print recording layer, the portion of the breakable print recording layer is removed from the discrimination medium and changes in color depending on the viewing angle, as recited in claim 1. In other words, Uyama fails to describe a thermosensitive breakage or an electronic discharge breakage, and further fails to describe that the portion of the breakable print recording layer is removed from the discrimination medium and changes in color depending on the viewing angle, as recited in claim 1.

At least because Uyama fails to describe a thermosensitive breakage or an electronic discharge breakage and further fails to describe that the portion of the breakable print recording layer is removed from the discrimination medium and changes in color depending on the viewing angle, as recited in claim 1, Uyama fails to anticipate claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-9.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Uyama. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Uyama fails to anticipate claim 1.

Additionally, Uyama fails to provide one of ordinary skill in the art with any reason or rationale have attempted a discrimination medium comprising a breakable print recording layer wherein when a thermosensitive breakage or an electronic discharge breakage is applied to a portion of the breakable print recording layer, the portion of the breakable print recording layer is removed from the discrimination medium and changes in color depending on the viewing angle, as recited in claim 1. Thus Uyama fails to render obvious independent claim 1. As such, Uyama also fails to render obvious dependent claim 5.

The Patent Office asserts that it would have allegedly been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have attempted a discrimination medium comprising an adhesive layer including a black pigment, as recited in claim 5. However, Uyama only describes that the base member 82 is a black polyester film. Uyama, column 18, line 32. Uyama provides no description or suggestion that base member 82 is an adhesive layer including a black pigment, as recited in claim 5. For at least this additional reason, Uyama fails to render obvious claim 5.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejoinder Of Withdrawn Claims

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 3-9 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above, and therefore Applicants respectfully request rejoinder and consideration of withdrawn claims 2 and 10-18. MPEP §821.04 states that claims eligible for rejoinder must depend from or require all the limitations of an allowable claim. Claims 2 and 12-18, drawn to a discrimination medium, and claims 10 and 11, drawn to a discrimination method for discriminating a discrimination medium, require all the limitations of independent claim 1, and therefore are eligible for rejoinder under MPEP §821.04. Accordingly, rejoinder of claims 2 and 10-18 is respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Christopher A. Fasel
Registration No. 59,204

WPB:CAF/hs

Enclosure:
Replacement Sheet

Date: August 27, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461